

Scoring Guide for Reflective Reading Response (Written and Spoken)

Rule of thumb for 4/satisfactory: Contribution pulls its fair share of the weight in discussion; if structure and exposition are weak, the content must be strong.

Note: If either the written or the spoken part is not assigned, double the percentage assigned to the relevant factors (1-3 or 4-6)

	Global	Factor 1 (10%): on time (written)	Factor 2 (25%): content of reflection	Factor 3 (15%): expository skill (written)	Factor 4 (10%): on time (classroom discussion)	Factor 5 (25%): content (spoken)	Factor 6 (15%) expository skill (spoken)
6	Add significant intellectual and personal contribution not overtly solicited by the text.	Received enough in advance that instructor could thoughtfully plan it into the discussion	Depth & breadth, both in conveying the content of the text & in intellectual & personal response to it. Structure is clear and effective.	Could serve as a model for other writers or to support an application for further education or for professional employment.	If there, score this as 6. If absent, score entire spoken part as 0.	Contribution was characterized by breadth, depth, and leadership.	No wasted words (redundancies, quirks). Need not be voluble, but must be eloquent and intelligent.
5	4 plus one of 6, or both to a minor extent	Received enough in advance that instructor knew at least that it could be used	Closer to 6 than to 4	Needs a few improvements to be 6. Instructor need only mention them briefly.	n.a.	Much of 6, but not among the very best	Couple lackluster moments
4	Has acquired basic knowledge of the text and uses it to contribute fair share to class discussion and/or equivalent written presentation. (Each could substitute for the other.) Does not strongly relate the reading to the Big Picture: the larger issues of the course & own education & life.	Received at the meeting during which the text was scheduled for discussion	Covers the essentials of the text. Structure sometimes goes beyond default parallel to that of text.	There are some unintentional lapses in standard language. Some of them can be corrected after merely being marked for reconsideration. Others need explanation in some detail.	n.a.	Spoke often, but either briefly or reactively (or equivalent mixture of the two)	Stretches of weak communication, but clearly outweighed by clarity, intelligibility and intelligence
3	Knowledge of text is accurate but in places sketchy or unintegrated, or else there is a major gap in it or a major misunderstanding.	Received within a day after the discussion was scheduled (and thus did not have much chance to poach on it).	Content elements appear to be thrown together without much regard for logical sequence.		n.a.	Participation limited to a few words.	Tries earnestly, sometimes succeeds, senses weaknesses
2	Problems in both features described in 3 above		[Below 3 is too insufficient to score.]		n.a.	[anything below 3 is 0]	Literally <i>careless</i> speech
1	Response is minimal: only sketchy knowledge of text, and no integration of its information and ideas.				n.a.		Below 2 is 0